

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

CLEO CHRISTOPHER

v.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL of  
BALTIMORE, INC., *et al.*

\*

\*

\*

...o0o...

CIVIL NO. CCB-12-2309

**MEMORANDUM**

Plaintiff Cleo Christopher, formerly employed by St. Vincent de Paul of Baltimore, Inc. (“SVDP”), has filed a complaint against SVDP and various individual defendants protesting her August 2010 termination from her job with SVDP. Ms. Christopher has submitted numerous medical records demonstrating her unfortunate physical and mental difficulties apparently resulting from cerebral aneurysm and/or strokes she suffered in 2009-2010.<sup>1</sup> She has not, however, proffered facts to support her claim of retaliation or discrimination based on her alleged disability. Indeed she also appears to claim that she was fired due to insubordination, or because she “knew too much,” or because of her daughter’s “leadership role” at Head Start. She has not plausibly stated a claim for discrimination or retaliation under the ADA or the Rehabilitation Act.<sup>2</sup> Nor has she alleged facts that would establish severe and pervasive conduct as required for a claim of harassment. *See, e.g., Rock v. McHugh*, 819 F. Supp. 2d 456, 470-71 (D. Md. 2011). Finally, there is no basis to hold the individual defendants liable under the law.<sup>3</sup>

---

1 According to Ms. Christopher, “In 2009/2010 school year I had started experiencing: marked memory loss, including confusion of names of staff members, parents and also names of immediate family members, slowing in my speech and thinking, left-right confusion, difficulty with reading comprehension, and changes in handwriting.” (Pl.’s Resp. at 2)

2 The EEOC found no basis to determine a violation had occurred.

3 For this reason the claims against Reginald U. Scriber, Shannon Burroughs-Campbell, and Shannon Harris-Robertson also will be dismissed.

*Baird ex rel. Baird v. Rose*, 192 F.3d 462, 472 (4th Cir. 1999).

While the court is certainly sympathetic to the plaintiff's circumstances as outlined in her medical records, she simply has not alleged a basis to hold the defendants liable. The court agrees with the positions set forth in the defendants' motion to dismiss and therefore will grant that motion by separate Order which follows.

February 7, 2013  
Date

/s/  
Catherine C. Blake  
United States District Judge